United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.16

General Assembly

Official Records

First Committee

16th Meeting
Wednesday, 8 November 1995, 10.00 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdenechuluun . . . . . (Mongolia)

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. de Icaza (Mexico), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

Agenda items 57 to 81 (*continued*)

Consideration of draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Acting Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish)*: The first speaker is the representative of Turkmenistan, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9. I now call upon her.

Mrs. Ataeva (Turkmenistan) *(interpretation from Russian)*: My country, Turkmenistan, has expressed its desire to make the policy of permanent neutrality the main principle of its foreign policy by giving legislative form to the will of its people. That principle is fully in keeping with the interests of the State, its prospects for development and its national, historic and geopolitical identity.

We continue to live in an unstable world rent by ethnic, territorial, religious and other conflicts. Since our country is located at the centre of a vast region that includes Central and South Asia, the Caspian Sea region and the Caucasus, we are constantly aware of the hot winds of such conflicts. Turkmenistan, a small and peace-loving State, is not involved in any ongoing conflicts and disputes, nor does it belong to any military alliances or blocs. However, history abounds in examples of small States that, against their will, have become caught up in the whirlwind of conflicts. We are convinced that by following a policy of neutrality, good-neighbourliness and cooperation, Turkmenistan will ensure its national interests to the maximum extent and will also contribute to the strengthening of stability and peace throughout the world. By pursuing that policy Turkmenistan will be able to realize the economic potential latent in its huge natural resources.

Turkmenistan's historic choice has been supported by the summit meeting of Heads of State and Government of the Economic Cooperation Organization held in March of this year at Islamabad and endorsed in its final resolution. In October 1995 Turkmenistan's neutrality was unanimously supported by the Eleventh Conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held at Cartagena and was reflected in the resolution adopted by that Conference.

The choice of States to pursue a policy of neutrality is a sovereign right and prerogative. However, the importance and significance of recognition of, and respect for, such a status by the international community cannot be overestimated. In 1815 the Congress of Vienna laid down the foundations of Switzerland's permanent neutrality and in 1955 the Four-Power Conference did the same for Austria. The Government of Turkmenistan has made great efforts to achieve recognition of its policy of permanent neutrality by the international community, represented by its highest forum, the United Nations. At the same time, we are fully aware and would like to state, forcefully and unambiguously, that such recognition in no way implies any obligations on the part of the international community as regards guarantees of Turkmenistan's permanent neutrality, nor does it involve any financial decisions of any kind. The will of the people and the people's historic choice are the only and sole guarantee.

95-86576 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

The Government of Turkmenistan proceeds on the assumption that firm commitment to the policy of permanent neutrality does not mean self-isolation. By promoting the peacemaking activities of the United Nations my country seeks to play the role of a neutral political entity to facilitate the civilized settlement of any dispute. In this connection Turkmenistan is facilitating the intra-Tadzhik political dialogue, supporting constructive resolution of the Afghan conflict and providing assistance in the implementation of economic-stabilization programmes in a number of countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Firm commitment to the norms and principles of international law enshrined in the United Nations Charter is an imperative of the foreign policy being implemented by neutral Turkmenistan.

On behalf of the people and the Government of my country, I should like to express my special appreciation to those States that have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution on Turkmenistan's permanent neutrality. I should like urgently to appeal to all Member States of the United Nations to support us at this crucial turning-point in our history and to adopt the proposed draft resolution.

The Acting Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I call on the representative of Pakistan, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40.

Mr. Khan Maneka (Pakistan): I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

The draft resolution encompasses three important aspects of international security and arms control: first, the threats to international peace and security posed by conventional arms build-ups; secondly, the need to control conventional arms at the regional and subregional levels, because the build-up of arms at the regional level, particularly in regions of tension, aggravates existing conditions and increases the chances of outright conflict, which endangers peace and security; and thirdly, in order to address the issue of conventional arms in its regional perspective, a request to the Conference on Disarmament to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control. It is this aspect of the draft resolution which makes it uniquely important.

It is a proposal to have a framework to actually control conventional arms. Until now the major effort has been directed, not at controlling conventional arms, but at instituting confidence-building measures and transparency, particularly in the areas of expenditures and transfers of conventional arms. We have pointed out the inherent shortcomings of this approach.

Substantive and meaningful measures for conventional arms control and disarmament have so far been undertaken in only one region.

The Acting Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I call on the representative of Sweden, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34.

Mr. Ekwall (Sweden): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34, on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mongolia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, and my own country, Sweden.

On 22 December 1993, States parties to the Convention requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to convene a review conference of the Convention and to establish a Group of Governmental Experts to prepare that Conference. As a matter of priority, the Group was given the task of preparing proposals for amendments to Protocol II of the Convention, relating to land-mines.

The Group of Governmental Experts held four meetings and completed its work by adopting a final report. This report was submitted to the Review Conference, which met in Vienna from 25 September to 13 October 1995.

The Chairman of the Review Conference, Ambassador Johan Molander of Sweden, will report to this Committee tomorrow on the progress made at the Review Conference and on his assessment of the work ahead.

Through the draft resolution I have the honour to introduce, the General Assembly would particularly

welcome the adoption by the Conference, on 13 October 1995, of the Protocol on Blinding Laser Weapons (Protocol IV), annexed to the Convention. The General Assembly would also commend this Protocol to all States, with a view to achieving the widest possible adherence to this instrument at an early date.

It is with particular satisfaction that Sweden notes the adoption of the Protocol on laser weapons, since we have worked actively for a ban on blinding laser weapons for close to a decade.

The Review Conference was not able to complete its review of Protocol II in Vienna. It therefore decided to continue its work at resumed sessions in Geneva from 15 to 19 January and from 22 April to 3 May 1996. The General Assembly would take note of this decision and call upon the States parties to intensify their efforts in order to conclude negotiations on a strengthened land- mine Protocol.

The General Assembly would also welcome the national measures adopted by Member States relating to the transfer, the production or the reduction of existing stockpiles of anti-personnel land-mines.

The 1980 Convention has so far entered into force only for 50 States. Consequently, the General Assembly would urgently call upon all States that have not yet done so to take all measures to become parties to the Convention and its Protocols as soon as possible, so that, ultimately, accession to these instruments would be universal.

We are faced with what is generally considered to be a land- mine catastrophe. This catastrophe requires concerted action. The various aspects involved — from production and transfer to use and clearance — are under consideration by the international community. It is also debating the possibility of an international ban on anti-personnel land-mines, although positions on this issue clearly differ.

At this session, the General Assembly will also adopt resolutions on a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines and on assistance in mine clearance. The present draft resolution deals with the equally fundamental issue of developing the international legal regime governing these weapons.

On behalf of the sponsors, I express the hope that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34 will be adopted without a vote. By doing so, we would in particular send a clear message that no effort should be spared in securing a successful outcome of the Review Conference under way.

The Acting Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call now on the representative of Mexico, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8.

Mrs. Rovirosa (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Three years ago, my delegation, together with the delegations of Australia and New Zealand, began a joint effort to gain the broadest possible support within the General Assembly for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. In 1993 and 1994, we achieved unanimous adoption of resolutions that enjoyed an unprecedentedly large number of sponsors.

This year's draft resolution reproduces the basic elements of last year's text, taking account of new circumstances. By draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8, the Assembly would welcome the continuing efforts in the multilateral negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty in the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban of the Conference on Disarmament, the significant contributions made by States participating in those negotiations, and progress in key areas. It would call upon all States to conclude, as a task of the highest priority, a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty so as to enable its signature by the outset of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8 consider this to be feasible in view of the commitment of all States to conclude negotiations on a treaty as soon as possible. To meet this commitment it will be necessary, as the draft resolution notes, for States to proceed to the final phase of the negotiation at the beginning of 1996 in order to complete the final text of the treaty not later than 30 June.

If the General Assembly supports this proposed timetable for the negotiations, it should state its readiness to resume consideration of this item, as necessary, before its fifty-first session in order to endorse the text of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. The draft resolution contains a provision to that effect, along with a request to the Secretary-General to ensure the provision to the Conference on Disarmament of adequate administrative, substantive and conference support services for these negotiations.

The delegation of Mexico is honoured to submit for the consideration of the First Committee draft resolution

A/C.1/50/L.8, which is at present sponsored by 77 delegations.

The Acting Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call now on the representative of Australia, who will also introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8.

Mr. Starr (Australia): I am delighted today to be joining with Mexico and New Zealand in introducing to the First Committee a draft resolution designed to underpin not simply the continuation of comprehensive test-ban-treaty negotiations in Geneva, but their successful conclusion by the northern summer of 1996 and the signature of the resulting treaty by the time we meet again in the autumn here in New York.

The reaffirmation by the international community of this intention, set out in paragraphs 2 and 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8, is the obvious rationale for the draft resolution. This is a realistic objective. There will be long negotiating days ahead of us. But the rolling text contained in the annual report of the Conference on Disarmament (A/50/27) makes it clear that the Geneva negotiations have progressed dramatically since we first achieved a full and historic consensus here two years ago on the commencement of the comprehensive test-ban treaty negotiation. A good treaty — the treaty we all need as a foundation for enhancing our individual security — is well within our collective grasp. Everyone knows this.

Secondly, this is intended to be a galvanizing objective. Achieving closure within the window of opportunity now before us requires the setting of concrete objectives for negotiators, objectives within which they can manage their resources and their overall participation. The coming year is not a year like any other. It will not be business as usual: 1996 is the year in which we, the international community, firmly intend to finalize a comprehensive test-ban treaty, the goal which has for decades floated frustratingly beyond our reach.

But let us be very clear. Even now, the comprehensive test-ban treaty will slip through our collective grasp unless we are galvanized into transforming the extraordinary political opportunity we now have into a real achievement.

This draft resolution is a necessary part of that transformation. Australia trusts that it will galvanize other preparations aimed at ensuring that the 1996 final phase of the negotiation is successful. We look to the nuclear-weapon States, for example, to pursue collectively and with determination their various and welcome public commitments to work for a fully credible zero-nuclear-yield comprehensive test-ban treaty. We look for this commitment to be expressed in specific text, and for all negotiating States to work hard to ensure that textual agreement on scope is complete by the outset of the 1996 negotiating session.

Thirdly, and above all, this draft resolution seeks to crystallize a shared objective. It does little more than articulate and put into understandable operational language the welcome political commitments given by all delegations engaged in the negotiations. The sponsors of the draft resolution believe that the time has come to spell out clearly the international community's expectation that the Conference on Disarmament will deliver a final product in the first half of 1996, to enable signature by the outset of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly. The credibility of our individual commitments is at stake. At the end of the day, do we really mean what we say about concluding and signing a comprehensive test-ban treaty and signing it in 1996?

Finally, this draft resolution is a milestone. It is the firm intention of the sponsors that this will be the last General Assembly resolution dealing with negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Next year, as we close one chapter of the life of the United Nations and enter its second half-century, we aim to have closed also the nuclear testing chapter, and to be opening a new chapter of international relations with a strong potential for the enhancement of the security of all. Next year, we expect to be speaking of the implementation of a treaty which, by then, will have been recently signed by the vast majority of the international community.

I hardly need to add that in addition to this powerful political symbolism, conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty is important to the vast majority of delegations represented in this room as the first fruits of the programme of action agreed upon in May by States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It will be a litmus test of the collective preparedness of all States Parties to deliver what we have undertaken.

Australia expects consensus on this draft resolution. This is the time for us to reinforce and articulate a commitment we have all undertaken. Australia expects this commitment, expressed with the authority of the entire international community, to galvanize the considerable effort which will be required on all sides to bring the treaty home. We have missed out before, including in the trilateral negotiations of the past. Let us declare through

this draft resolution our determination not to squander the present opportunity, or to miss out again.

The Acting Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of New Zealand, who will also introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8.

Mr. Rider (New Zealand): It is with great pleasure that I follow the representatives of Mexico and Australia to speak in support of the draft resolution on a comprehensive test-ban treaty contained in document A/C.1/50/L.8. I would like to say to the Acting Chairman that it gives me particular pleasure to offer this personal support while he is in the Chair. His work in coordinating efforts to produce a text which 77 countries in this Committee have been able to co-sponsor is much appreciated.

For many years, New Zealand has been working with its partners in submitting resolutions calling for a comprehensive test-ban treaty. It is a matter for satisfaction that, for the last two years, the annual resolution on the subject has been adopted by consensus. We look forward with great confidence to that same measure of agreement this year.

This text this year is short and straightforward. With the time-frame introduced, it reflects the way in which the expectations of the international community in nuclear matters have advanced in the last two or three years. Testing is no longer acceptable. The international community has agreed that it will be finished once and for all and on a comprehensive basis.

A consensus resolution setting a time-frame for completion of the text will mark a major step forward. It cannot be overemphasized how substantial and beneficial will be the effect of a comprehensive treaty in the area of non-proliferation and as a major achievement in our quest for the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

I have been speaking about the future and in a positive way. I believe that I am justified in doing so. This is certainly not the time to be negative or cautious. New Zealand has been pleased with the results achieved this year in the negotiations on the treaty but much remains to be done. The momentum of the negotiations must be maintained. The task of concluding the text of a treaty is a matter of the highest priority. That task will be greatly assisted through the adoption by this Committee of a text freely accepted by consensus. Accordingly, I have much pleasure in joining with my Mexican and Australian colleagues in commending the text to the First Committee for favourable attention.

The Acting Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Peru to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24.

Mr. Guillén (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Peru is pleased to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa and United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean". The draft resolution is supported by South Africa on behalf of the African Group of States and by Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Japan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela. We trust that this year, as in the past, the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

The draft resolution has retained some elements of resolution 49/76 D and has included the following complementary concepts. First, reference is made to the critical financial situation affecting Regional Centres in the terms used by the Secretary-General in his report of August 1995 in reference to these Centres. Secondly, a request is made to the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), to promote the development of activities related to peace and education for disarmament through these Regional Centres.

Because of the severe financial limitations of which we are all aware, the Regional Centres may close down. This is a real and imminent danger that we wish to avoid. Since their establishment in 1986, the Centres have done outstanding work in that they have heightened the people's awareness of the need for disarmament and of the obvious relationship between the arms build-up and underdevelopment. In the immediate future, the Centres will continue to encourage disarmament and, at the same time, prepare integral doctrines on security in accordance with the specific conditions of the respective regions in which they operate. In this connection, it is particularly noteworthy to see the momentum the Kathmandu Centre has gathered, which is both cause and effect of indispensable political will and vital voluntary contributions. Both factors are crucial to the proper functioning of the Regional Centres.

In recent years, States Members of the United Nations have made unprecedented efforts to bring the Organization into line with new world realities. We have emphasized the deep-seated causes of international instability and insecurity and have come up with innovative approaches for dealing with them in terms of prevention. These efforts and these plans must be transmitted to civil society and the general public. The Regional Centres are in the best position to pass on this message, which must also help to promote the ideal of a culture of peace and its key component, education for peace. The UNESCO Culture of Peace Programme and its interest in working together with other international disarmament organizations through its information and communication system are compatible with the role of Regional Centres in disseminating information concerning disarmament. This link will make it possible to give new momentum to the efforts of the Centres and the United Nations to inspire and lead mankind towards a better world for all.

In the general debate in the Committee on 25 October 1995, my delegation stated that Peru was requesting the voluntary support of the Latin American and Caribbean countries, as well as that of other countries from the western hemisphere and was turning to alternative sources of financing so that the Regional Centre in Lima, Peru, might be able to cope with the new tasks related to peace arising from the current dynamics in international relations in the post-cold-war period. Thus, the delegation of Peru would like to emphasize that machinery for confidence-building, preventive diplomacy, the maintenance and building of peace, the diversion of current military expenditures towards social development activities, arms limitation and the participation of regional agencies in disarmament, security and stability, zones of peace, nuclear-free zones and zones free of other weapons of mass destruction, consultative and cooperation arrangements and the role of the United Nations: these are among the current and important issues that the United Nations can publicize through the proposals contained in this draft resolution, thereby perhaps, providing new tools for revitalizing the work of the Regional Centres.

Mr. Afeto (Togo) *(interpretation from French)*: My delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa and United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean", which has just been introduced by the Permanent Representative of Peru to the United Nations.

This draft, drawn up within the framework of agenda item 71 (c) concerning the review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly is also sponsored by South Africa on behalf of the members of the African Group of States and by numerous other States of Latin America, the Caribbean and Asia.

The United Nations Regional Centres in Africa and in Latin America, which were established in 1986 and 1987 respectively, have as their main purpose to supply States, on request, practical support for the initiatives they will undertake and for the efforts they will be making to promote peace, development, disarmament and arms limitation. In that context, the Centres have had to disseminate information on these issues for Governments, students, researchers and other individual and legal entities interested in the problems of disarmament and development. They have also organized seminars and conferences and carried out studies.

For its part, the Regional Centre for Africa based in Lomé, Togo, has, over the last few years, conducted a number of studies dealing with the causes of conflicts in Africa and border problems existing in the five African subregions.

In 1994, with the assistance of the United Nations Information Centre in Lomé, the Regional Centre for Africa organized, on the occasion of United Nations Day and Disarmament Week, an information day throughout the regions and districts of the country, with the cooperation of the Togo Federation of Associations and Clubs of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. It also lent its technical and administrative support to the standing Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters and security in Central Africa and contributed to the study conducted by the Secretariat on the question of the proliferation of small arms in the Sahelo-Saharan subregion.

All information relating to the life and programme of activities of the Regional Centres is contained in the report of the Secretary-General — document A/50/380.

Consideration of this report reveals that the programme of activities of the three Regional Centres are rather far-ranging and in keeping with the mandate given to them by the General Assembly when they were established. It can be seen from this report, however, that the financial situation of these bodies is rather alarming, particularly that of the Centre for Africa and the Centre for Latin America

and the Caribbean. This has led the Secretary-General to envisage and advocate the extreme solution of closing the Centres if Member States fail to shoulder their responsibilities in finding appropriate solutions at this fiftieth session of the General Assembly to the problem of financing the Centres.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24, which include all the States of Africa, believe that peace and security are priceless and that they cannot therefore be assessed in financial terms.

They believe, moreover, that at a time when their respective States are facing the phenomenon of anarchical proliferation and the illegal traffic in small arms in their regions, the Centres have a dominant role to play in helping to put an end to this scourge. The Centre can also be used to contribute and play a decisive role in preventive diplomacy to assist in stopping any conflict, whether latent or open, to prevent it from becoming an open wound, which is then much more difficult to control.

It is along these lines that in paragraph 2 they have reaffirmed their strong support for further operation and strengthening of the two Regional Centres.

To cope with the problem of financing, an appeal is made, in paragraph 5, to Member States, as well as to international governmental and non-governmental organizations and foundations, to make more substantial voluntary contributions to the special fund set put for that purpose in order to revitalize the two Centres, strengthen their programmes of activities and facilitate the effective implementation of these programmes. The Secretary-General is requested to explore new ways to find adequate financing for the activities of the two Centres.

To allow the Regional Centres to achieve more positive results in the future the sponsors believe that their directors should, in so far as possible, be locally based for greater effectiveness. This is all the more urgent and necessary because in the case of the Regional Centre for Africa, in particular, the Government of Togo is providing at no cost electricity and other expenses. It is also making available, at no cost to the United Nations, the premises housing the Centre, and a modern villa which serves as the residence for the Director and his family.

Taking all of these considerations into account, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24 urge Member States to pay increased attention to the problems of the Regional Centres by providing them with the material and financial means which they need to carry out effectively their mandate of advancing peace, security, disarmament and development in the regions concerned.

The question is an important one. The sponsors therefore hope that it will receive the full attention of all United Nations Member States so that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.24 can be, as in past years, adopted without a vote.

The Acting Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I call on the representative of Pakistan to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.38.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Regional disarmament" contained in document A/C.1/50/L.38, on behalf of the following sponsors: Albania, Armenia, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, Egypt, Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, Niger, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Zambia and Zimbabwe and my own delegation.

Throughout history, the concerns and consequences of wars and conflicts have been largely local and regional in nature. The exceptions were the imperial wars of yesteryear and the historic confrontation between the two super-Powers during the cold war. In the post-cold-war era, once again major threats to international peace and security emanate from regional disputes and conflicts, which have proliferated in so many parts of the world. These conflicts are often the *raison d'être* of the regional race for the acquisition and accumulation of armaments. This in turn leads to the escalation in the scale of violence and suffering in ongoing conflicts. Furthermore, the imbalances created in such regional arms races accentuate the danger of aggression and the use of force, as also the search for non-conventional means of self-defence and deterrence.

The international community has now fully accepted the proposition that arms control and disarmament measures at the global level cannot effectively address the aspects of arms races emanating from regional dynamics. Global arms control and disarmament must be complemented by regional measures, and vice versa. Global and regional disarmament should be pursued simultaneously. Global measures are necessary to create conditions conducive to regional disarmament, while regional disarmament measures will be essential for the achievement of the goal of general and complete disarmament.

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/50/L.38 affirms these propositions regarding the importance of regional disarmament. It takes into account most of the guidelines for regional disarmament adopted by the Disarmament Commission in 1993. It also underlines the fact that regional disarmament measures would enhance the security of small States and thus contribute to international peace and security by reducing the risk of regional conflicts.

In its operative part, the draft resolution also calls on States to conclude agreements, wherever possible, for nuclear non-proliferation, disarmament and confidence-building measures at the regional and subregional levels. The progress made towards nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in several parts of the world is a most encouraging sign of the potential of the regional approach to disarmament. The draft resolution therefore welcomes the initiatives that have been taken by some States for disarmament, non-proliferation and security at the regional and subregional levels, and supports the efforts for confidence-building measures.

My delegation hopes that the draft resolution will be adopted once again by an overwhelming majority.

The Acting Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Afghanistan, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37.

Mr. Osman (Afghanistan): Allow me to introduce a significant draft resolution on measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms, document A/C.1/50/L.37.

I remind members of General Assembly resolution 49/75 M of last year, which recognized that the availability of massive quantities of conventional weapons and their illicit transfer were often associated with destabilizing activities and the violation of human rights. My delegation is of the conviction that the illicit availability of arms encourages certain groups to bypass peaceful means of resolving disputes and turn to violence.

We believe that peace and security are strongly linked with — and in some cases are imperative for — economic development and reconstruction in many States. Curbing illicit transfers and also the use of conventional arms is a most important step towards general and complete disarmament. When arms are illicitly transferred and stockpiled in a State, they will not remain confined within that State: the arms will diffuse out and fall into the hands of terrorists and mercenaries, who will create terror and destruction and pose a threat to the peace and stability of many States in the same region and even beyond.

I trust that all representatives are in agreement with me that we should fulfil our historic obligations towards the enduring legacy of the peace process, and the adoption of this draft resolution by consensus will bring us one step closer to this common goal.

My delegation has joined in sponsoring a number of draft resolutions in the field of general and complete disarmament and the maintenance of peace and security, and we especially support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, according to which the General Assembly would declare the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan. I am sure that Turkmenistan will play an active and positive role in preserving peace and security internationally, in the region and beyond.

Mr. Ramaker (Netherlands): I wish to thank the Swedish delegation for submitting and once again this year introducing a draft resolution — this time draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34 — on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects — commonly known as the Convention on certain conventional weapons.

The Netherlands is one of the sponsors of this draft resolution, and would like to take this opportunity to underline its value in contributing to the necessary restraint in the use of certain categories of conventional weapons, notably land-mines.

The havoc wrought by land-mines has gravely affected civilian populations in particular, not only during armed conflicts around the globe but also long after these conflicts have ended. Tightening the international rules on land-mines is part of concerted efforts by the international community to deal with the tragedies caused by these weapons.

Sweden has traditionally submitted this draft resolution, with the intention of creating a greater awareness of the importance of the Convention on certain conventional weapons and its Protocols and to increase adherence to them. These efforts are now bearing fruit, especially since France took the initiative two years ago of requesting the depositary, the United Nations Secretary-General, to convene a review conference with the main purpose of strengthening Protocol II to the Convention, on

land-mines. The preparatory process for the Review Conference — although there was no agreement on each and every detail of how to strengthen Protocol II — resulted, apparently, in good prospects for a conference that would be of great importance for helping resolve the world-wide problems caused by land-mines.

In the meantime, the increased political attention being paid to the Convention has caused the number of States parties to it to go from a modest 35 two years ago to 50 now, so it is not without good reason that according to the Swedish draft resolution the General Assembly would welcome these developments.

In view of the growing attention to the grave problems caused by land-mines and the increasing recognition by the international community of the relevance in this regard of the 1980 Convention and the importance of strengthening its Protocol II, it was with high hopes that the Netherlands delegation went to Vienna last September intending to make the Review Conference a success. Unfortunately, we left that city three weeks later in disappointment. Certainly, the agreement on a new Protocol on blinding laser weapons should be hailed as an important achievement, for not only does that Protocol ban the use of a future category of weapons, it further enhances the relevance of the conventional weapons Convention as an instrument of international humanitarian law, but nevertheless it was clear from the outset that world opinion would judge the Vienna Review Conference in the light of its contribution to stemming the ever-increasing, disastrous effects of the unrestrained use of land-mines. It was therefore regrettable indeed that, after all the preparatory work and after the intense efforts at the Conference itself, agreement on a meaningful strengthening of Protocol II was not within reach.

Disappointing as the three weeks in Vienna turned out to be, it was nevertheless a positive sign that at the end of the Conference the participating States themselves realized that work should continue. It was the general feeling that during the continued review process we should all do our utmost to conclude the negotiations on a substantially strengthened Protocol II. In this respect, the Netherlands delegation echoes the call made in the draft resolution for States parties to intensify their efforts to achieve that aim. In simply noting the fact that the Review Conference was not able to complete its work on Protocol II, the Swedish draft is expressing the wish shared by my delegation that we should be forward-looking, and work constructively together when the Conference resumes in January and continues in April-May next year.

More hard work is indeed needed to achieve positive results. We are hopeful that this will be possible. During the final days of the Vienna Conference a basic understanding was reached on what elements are of importance for technical requirements of land-mines, especially as far as detectability, self-destruction or self-neutralization and self-deactivating back-up is concerned. We should build on this in January 1996, when the Conference resumes its work because without meaningful agreement on technical requirements for land-mines, any prohibition of, or restriction on, the use thereof would risk being an empty shell.

There are other positive elements on which the resumed Review Conference should build. The consensus that the scope of Protocol II should be extended to include internal armed conflicts, and the fact that there is now general acceptance of the principle that an amended Protocol II should also incorporate restrictions on transfers of land-mines are an example of these elements.

We should all reflect on what could be an acceptable outcome of the Review Conference. In this respect, some States parties have referred to legitimate security concerns. We understand those concerns. However, the Netherlands delegation and the Netherlands believe that we should be guided on this issue by the generally accepted principle of the law of warfare — that there should be a proper balance between military necessity and humanitarian concerns.

The Acting Chairman: (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Congo, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.20.

Mr. Bakala (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.20, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures", on behalf of the 11 States members of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa, namely Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, the Congo, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Chad and Zaire.

Everyone is aware of the acts of violence, of the tensions, the conflicts and the atmosphere of insecurity that have dominated Central Africa over the past few years. The proliferation of weapons and the emergence of armed bands have been the major factors in the spawning of violence and insecurity in the subregion. The United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa, which held its seventh ministerial meeting

last August in Brazzaville, observing the geopolitical situation of the subregion, noted a clear improvement in that situation given the historic peace agreements signed between the Government of Angola and UNITA, as well as the peace efforts of the United Nations under way in Burundi and Rwanda, and also the restoration of peace in the Republic of the Congo.

However, improvement in no way means eradication of the underlying evil — the eradication of those threats that jeopardize the internal security of the Committee's members. Peace remains fragile in the subregion. It is because of this that this year the member States of the Committee are submitting a draft resolution which involves a slight change from resolution 49/76 C, adopted last year by the General Assembly.

In order for peace to be guaranteed, and in order to preserve peace where it has been threatened, the members of the Committee have decided to use special units in peace-keeping operations. But, clearly, this task can be completed successfully only if the special units of the subregion receive adequate training. It is for that purpose that the Secretary-General is requested in the draft resolution to facilitate the organization of a training seminar for the establishment of special units in peace-keeping operations. Inasmuch as we have met here to discuss questions of peace and international security, let us not forget that peace in Central Africa is still fragile. When we deal with this draft resolution, let us give thought to that fact so as to prevent the subregion from sinking once again into violence and deadly conflict.

The Acting Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I call on the representative of Colombia, who on behalf of the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, will introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.25, A/C.1/50/L.26 and A/C.1/50/L.44 and draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30.

Mr. García (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: On behalf of the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, I have the pleasure to introduce three draft resolutions.

The first draft resolution, contained in document A/C.1/50/L.26, refers to the relationship between disarmament and development, under item 70 (h) of our agenda. This issue was discussed at the recent summit of the Heads of State and Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held in Cartagena, Colombia. They reiterated their concern about the fact that the arms race in the contemporary world was absorbing a large proportion of human, financial, material and technological resources, and was placing heavy burdens on the economies of all countries, in particular those of developing countries. It had an impact on international financial and trade flows. There was a dramatic contrast between military expenditures in the world and the impact of underdevelopment, with its aftermath of poverty and misery afflicting more than two thirds of humanity.

It is of the utmost urgency that the international community should allocate to economic and social development a share of the resources released as a result of the implementation of disarmament agreements, in order to reduce the tremendous gap between developed and developing countries. This is the gist of the draft resolution we have the honour to submit.

The second draft resolution which we are submitting on behalf of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries concerns the convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament — item 70 (g) of the agenda. It is contained in document A/C.1/50/L.25. As is known, during the decade 1978 to 1988 there were three special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The changes in the international arena clearly justify speedy consideration of the most important issues relating to the disarmament process, and to mobilizing the international community and public opinion in support of the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and the control and reduction of conventional weapons.

In view of the fact that at the end of 1996 negotiations on important disarmament issues will have been concluded, and important agreements will have been adopted, the year 1997 would be the appropriate time to review the progress made in the area of disarmament in the post-war period. This draft resolution also calls for the establishment of a preparatory committee to prepare recommendations on this item in the course of the next session of the General Assembly.

The third draft resolution that we are submitting on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries refers to bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament. This draft resolution, contained in document A/C.1/50/L.44, retains the basic points of resolution 49/75 L submitted by our Movement last year — a resolution adopted without a vote. In the draft we are submitting now there are some changes. It also covers the most recent

developments in this connection, as well as some proposals adopted by the Heads of State or Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, contained in the Final Declaration of the Eleventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non Aligned Countries, held at Cartagena de Indias, Colombia, from 18 to 20 October 1995.

We are also submitting a draft decision under item 60 of the agenda. That decision set forth in document A/C.1/50/L.30, calls for the inclusion in the provisional agenda of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly of the item entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security".

Finally, I should like to say that the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has also submitted a draft resolution on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. That draft will be introduced by the Ambassador of Sri Lanka.

The Acting Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Japan, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7.

Ms. Kurokochi (Japan): I should like, on behalf of the 17 sponsors, to introduce a draft resolution on small arms. In operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution, contained in document A/C.1/50/L.7, the Secretary-General is requested, with the assistance of a panel group of governmental experts to be nominated by him, to prepare a report on, *inter alia*, the ways and means to prevent and reduce excessive and destabilizing accumulation and transfer of small arms and light weapons, in particular as they cause or exacerbate conflicts.

In preparing this draft resolution, my delegation has had informal consultations with many other delegations interested in this subject. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those that made useful comments, which helped us a great deal in improving upon our original text. It is the hope of my delegation that this draft resolution will attract widespread support at the time of action on it.

The Acting Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Algeria, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.36.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has asked to speak to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.36, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region". The Algerian delegation is honoured today to introduce this draft resolution on behalf of the following countries: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritania, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, Portugal, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia and the United Kingdom.

This year again the group of traditional sponsors, which has subsequently been enlarged with the sponsorship of the other countries of the European Union, reflects support for the shared will of the States of the Mediterranean basin to make our region a zone of peace, security and cooperation, thereby giving to the Mediterranean its mission of "a lake of peace".

Assisted by the atmosphere of *détente* on the global level, the Mediterranean countries, over the last few years, have stepped up their shared efforts to consolidate peace and security in the region, and to lay down the basis for multiform cooperation, which is indispensable for the prosperity and stability of the countries of the Mediterranean area.

In addition, all the members of the European Union have associated themselves this year with the coastal countries of the Mediterranean, to reflect their readiness to participate in strengthening the prospects for ever closer Euro-Mediterranean cooperation.

The draft resolution which the sponsors are submitting to our Committee does not differ basically from the resolutions adopted at previous sessions. In fact, the multidimensional approach to security and cooperation in the Mediterranean area continues to predominate in the concerted action of the countries of the region. To make the Mediterranean a shared area of security and cooperation, the draft resolution reiterates the fundamental principles contained in operative paragraphs 1 and 2, and recalls the need to eliminate the economic and social disparities among the countries of the Mediterranean basin.

The Mediterranean countries, in fact, consider full respect for these principles as indispensable for the strengthening of inter-Mediterranean relations. It is moreover in that context that the countries of the two shores have undertaken numerous concerted efforts to convene a Euro-Mediterranean ministerial conference which will take place in Barcelona on 27 and 28 November.

In that context, I wish to mention in particular the Ministerial Meeting of the Mediterranean Forum, held at Tabarka, in Tunisia, on 28 and 29 July last, which was devoted to preparations for the Barcelona Conference. That is why this draft resolution encourages precisely the kinds of efforts that are being made by the Mediterranean countries jointly to define their future relations in order to meet common challenges through appropriate means, in a spirit of partnership aimed at turning the Mediterranean Basin into an area of dialogue, exchanges and cooperation, guaranteeing peace, stability and prosperity for all.

The sponsors of the draft resolution hope that the forthcoming Barcelona Conference will contribute to freeing Euro-Mediterranean relations from mistaken perceptions, to deepening political, economic and cultural cooperation, and to promoting Euro-Mediterranean partnership. Barcelona should thus provide a valuable opportunity to lay down the priority guidelines for Euro-Mediterranean cooperation and to launch a cultural dialogue as a factor in the *rapprochement* of the peoples of the region.

As concerns disarmament, the States of the region are urged, while taking into account the specific nature of the Mediterranean Basin, to base themselves on the results of the Review and Extension Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to adhere to all legal instruments on disarmament as an important step in advancing the security of all the coastal States of the Mediterranean. In addition, the States of the region are urged to favour the necessary conditions for strengthening confidence-building measures among them, in particular by promoting transparency in the area of weapons and by participating in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms as well as in the system for the standardized reporting of military expenditures.

Moreover, through this draft resolution, the sponsors also wish to reaffirm their will to mobilize with regard to the problems facing the countries of the Mediterranean region, in order to combat terrorism, crime and drug trafficking and to halt the illicit transfer of weapons. The sponsors also reiterate their determination to combat all phenomena that hinder the advancement of human rights and fundamental freedoms and the establishment of the foundations of democracy and a pluralist society.

The sponsors mentioned earlier are confident that Committee members will, as was the case at previous sessions, unanimously support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.36 by adopting it without a vote.

The Acting Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Cuba, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.41.

Mr. Rivero (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to introduce to the First Committee the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.41, entitled "Adherence to environmental standards in the elaboration and implementation of disarmament and arms control agreements". This draft is introduced under agenda item 70, "General and complete disarmament".

The draft resolution submitted initially by the delegation of Cuba refers to a matter that is rarely addressed in our Committee but one to which all countries are paying increasing attention in the elaboration and implementation of disarmament agreements, namely the question of protection of the environment. As the draft indicates, on the one hand an appeal is made to the multilateral disarmament negotiating forum — the Conference on Disarmament — to take into account the importance of protection of the environment when preparing agreements on disarmament or the limitation of weapons, and, to this end, to take all steps necessary to ensure the inclusion of standards to this effect in such disarmament agreements. It also emphasizes that, in implementing, in all its aspects, the Convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, account should be taken of environmental protection standards.

Further, as concerns the Convention on the prohibition of biological weapons and the work of the ad hoc group that is to consider a possible verification mechanism for the Convention, such norms should, to the extent possible, also be taken into account.

The draft also contains a reference to the positive implications that a comprehensive test-ban treaty would have for the environment. In this connection, an appeal is addressed to the Conference on Disarmament to conclude that treaty as a matter of the highest priority — at the very latest by next year, 1996.

The draft also mentions the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques. We would express the wish of the General Assembly to prohibit the use of such techniques. The draft appeals to those States that are not yet parties to that Convention to accede to it with a view to ensuring its universality.

As can be noted, an attempt is made in the draft resolution to include existing concerns relative to environmental protection within the context of disarmament agreements: we are not referring to the environment *per se*. We hope that the draft will receive the firm support of members of the Committee and will be adopted without a vote.

In view of the consultations under way, a revised text and an up-to-date list of sponsors will be submitted later.

The Acting Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Egypt, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19.

Mr. Karem (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I am pleased, at the outset, to congratulate Mr. Erdenechuluun on his election to the Chair of this Committee. I am also personally pleased to congratulate my brother and friend, the representative of Jordan, on his appointment as Rapporteur of the First Committee. Let me also express our appreciation for the efforts of the First Committee's Secretary, Mr. Kheradi.

This statement was to be delivered by the Permanent Representative of Egypt, Ambassador Nabil Elaraby, in his capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group for November, but circumstances dictated otherwise. Allow me to deliver this statement in his stead.

My delegation is pleased today to introduce, in its capacity as Chairman of the Group of States members of the League of Arab States for the month of November, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.19, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

For decades now the Middle East has been the scene of conflict and the theatre of devastating wars which posed a continuing grave threat to international peace and security. With the progress achieved by the peace process and the budding forth of its fruits, the latest of which was the second interim agreement on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip which was signed in September 1995, the need is more pressing than ever to safeguard the region from the grave consequences of the existence in it of nuclear weapons and of the attendant perils of a nuclear arms race. There is no doubt that the total elimination of these threats would contribute to consolidating peace and to accelerating its momentum at this sensitive juncture in the region's history. This desired aim cannot be achieved unless all States in the region undertake equal, balanced and reciprocal obligations and enjoy equal rights. The keyword here is equality, and I repeat: equality, across the board.

The realization of universal adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty remains the genuine and effective means of eliminating the threat of nuclear proliferation. The draft resolution now before us in document A/C.1/50/L.19 aims at achieving this universality at the regional level in a balanced manner, by calling on all States not yet party to the non-proliferation Treaty to accede to the Treaty and to fully place all their nuclear facilities, on an equal footing, under full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

At the same time, the draft resolution addresses the nuclear capabilities of the States not yet party to the Treaty in a realistic fashion by reflecting a clear factual distinction that has to be recognized and redressed. There is only one State in the region, namely Israel, that is not party yet to the Treaty while it possesses advanced unsafeguarded nuclear capabilities, whereas the other States which are not yet party to the Treaty have no nuclear programmes whatsoever, let alone any advanced unsafeguarded nuclear capabilities.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have legitimate expectations. They expect the international community to apply one single standard where the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East is concerned and not to allow the use of any double standards. They expect complete unequivocal support for this draft resolution and, thereby, for the NPT itself. The issue at stake here is not a regional political dispute but rather the very credibility of the global non-proliferation regime. It is totally unwarranted and discriminatory to shelter any non-party to the Treaty from the need to acquiesce in the general and solid resolve of the international community to ensure universal adherence to the Treaty. Any exception will only cast grave doubts on the credibility of the results of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and on the sincerity and intentions of the States parties to the NPT *vis-à-vis* the Middle East region especially when the Conference has found it necessary to adopt a separate resolution on the Middle East wherein it voiced very clearly the concern felt by the international community *vis-à-vis* the present situation I have just outlined.

The stark reality is that the postures of all the States parties to the NPT must be consistent. Striving for the realization of universal adherence to the Treaty is a legal obligation as well as a moral principle. It is also a fact that

many States parties to the NPT hesitate to support the principle of universality because the only State in the Middle East with unsafeguarded nuclear facilities is named in the draft resolution. To those parties I affirm that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19 calls upon all the States in the Middle East, and I repeat: all the States of the Middle East, in a precise, balanced and objective fashion, to accede to the Treaty. This call constitutes an invitation to one of the most advanced countries in the nuclear field to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty on equal terms with all the other non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT whose number now exceeds 180 States.

Quite frankly, there is no selectiveness or singling out in the draft resolution. It is those who hesitate to support it that are being selective towards the Middle East by sending a clear message that says quite clearly that as far as the Middle East is concerned, nuclear proliferation is permissible and double standards do indeed apply.

The sponsors of the draft resolution sincerely hope that at this fiftieth-anniversary session the guiding principle will be the attainment of the lofty goals enunciated by Heads of State or Government in their solemn collective Declaration on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations, and the translation of those goals into concrete reality by sparing the Middle East the horrific threat of nuclear destruction.

Mrs. Samate (Burkina Faso) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation joins others in supporting draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.29, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them", which was introduced yesterday by the representative of the Republic of Mali on behalf of the other sponsors, including Burkina Faso.

For the countries of the Sahelo-Saharan subregion, small arms constitute a threat to peace and security. They not only impede disarmament but also increase insecurity. Hence, it is important to encourage the initiatives and activities mutually agreed upon by the States of our subregion to put an end to the scourge of the traffic in small arms. Such subregional action can be effective only with the support of the international community, and my delegation appeals to all States to support the efforts of our countries to halt trafficking in these arms, and to help in curbing this traffic and in collecting the weapons.

We hope that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.29 will enjoy broad support in the First Committee and in the General Assembly.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): I wish to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19 that has just been introduced. The draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East" is, regrettably, once again on the agenda of the First Committee. Although its removal from the agenda on account of its singling out of Israel has been long overdue, the present text represents further escalation both in letter and spirit.

The draft resolution, as submitted, continues to single out Israel, is out of tune with the Middle East process and serves no other purpose than to discomfit Israel. The singling out of Israel and the phenomenon of name-calling in this draft resolution have not only been maintained but an additional operative paragraph, paragraph 2, has been inserted, singling out Israel, though indirectly and not by name.

Furthermore, the new fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs contain elements which go counter to the basic concept of Israel's policy which underlines the regional approach, direct negotiations encompassing all States of the region, and mutual verification arrangements. Israel's declared support of the extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) does not detract from the fact that Israel is not party to that convention and is not bound by the decisions of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The entire draft resolution, with its additional paragraphs, does not change the oft-repeated valid argument that, substantively, this draft resolution is devoid of any message that is not included in other resolutions. Thus, its politically motivated purpose is exposed and befits the anachronistic past of the Arab-Israeli confrontation and not the spirit of reconciliation that prevails today in the region.

Israel has gone an extra mile to placate Arab concerns by generating remarkable progress in the peace process. It should be recalled that Israel is the one to take high risks in the peace process and its continued arraignment in United Nations resolutions will be counter-productive to peacemaking efforts. At the same time, Israel does not believe that the nuclear issue should be lifted from the context of peacemaking efforts either in priority or in timing.

No extraregional prescription or imposition of any kind will be conducive to the enhancement of peace in the region. The progress in the peace process, thus far, by

direct negotiations, amply and remarkably proves this notion. The tone and content of this draft resolution can only serve to undermine the peace process.

Israel will continue to oppose this draft resolution on account both of its name-calling and of its overall adverse effect on the peace process. These two principles should not be ignored any longer, otherwise the delicate balance on this matter might be upset. Therefore, we call upon all those who abstained or supported this obsolete resolution to vote against it and, thus, to stretch out their hand to the ongoing efforts for peace and reconciliation in the Middle East.

Mr. Mpay (Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): As my delegation is taking the floor for the first time in this Committee I would like to extend our congratulations to the Chairman on his election and on the way in which he has been guiding our work. I also wish to congratulate the other members of the Bureau.

The delegation of Cameroon wishes to express its support for draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.20, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures".

To understand the grounds for that draft resolution and its scope, we must, on the one hand, consider the fact that the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa was established by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to promote peace, security and development in the subregion. On the other hand, we must consider the fact that the subregion to which the 11 States members of the Standing Advisory Committee belong is a region that has experienced, and continues to experience, crises and conflicts which could destabilize the entire subregion. I shall merely recall here the situations in Angola, Rwanda and Burundi, which have led to the vast mobilization of both the material and the financial resources of the entire international community in an effort to find a solution. The subregion to which the 11 States members of the Committee belong thus deserves the special attention of our Committee.

The draft resolution — A/C.1/50/L.20 — differs little from the resolutions adopted by our Committee at earlier sessions. It does however introduce a new element, which is fully justified in terms of preventive diplomacy. On the basis of the lessons learned from the difficulties which the Secretary-General of the United Nations ran into in deploying peace-keeping forces, in particular in Rwanda, the members of the Committee decided to set up peace-keeping units within their respective armed forces. Those units will be available to, and can be deployed at a moment's notice by, the Secretary-General of the United Nations for any peace-keeping mission either in the subregion or elsewhere in the world.

The 11 countries of the subregion are proposing the setting up of what in fact amounts to a reserve force of almost 10,000 soldiers for peace. The countries members of the Committee with neither the theoretical knowledge nor the practical experience to organize such peace-keeping operations have no choice but to appeal to our Organization, which will need to have the reserve force available so that the units can be trained and prepared in order to be effective.

The permanent availability of this force in our subregion will make it possible to ward off many conflicts, in particular since the countries of the Committee plan to make this an instrument for advancing security in the subregion. It is a outstanding instrument of preventive diplomacy, which we should all encourage. Had this instrument existed in the subregion before, the crises and conflicts which the region has experienced might not have occurred on such a scale, which would have spared the international community from mobilizing such vast resources to resolve them. We are, therefore, convinced that prevention is better than cure, which is the rationale behind all the confidence-building measures that have been adopted by the Standing Advisory Committee so far. We urge the members of our Committee to adopt the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.20 by consensus.

The Acting President (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of South Africa, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21.

Ms. Mxakato-Diseko (South Africa): It is a singular honour for me to present to the First Committee of the fiftieth session of the United Nations General Assembly the draft resolution on the "Expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament" contained in document A/C.1/50/L.21.

The urgent need to expand the membership of the Conference on Disarmament was recognized by the United Nations General Assembly during its forty-ninth session when it adopted resolution 49/77 B without a vote. This resolution played a significant role in the decision of the Conference on Disarmament to adopt the report of Ambassador Paul O'Sullivan, the Special Coordinator for Membership during the 1993 session of the Conference, in

which he recommended an expansion of the membership of the Conference to include Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, Iraq, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukraine, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

Ambassador O'Sullivan's report further argued for a dynamic solution to the question of membership. My delegation also wishes here to again pay a special tribute to the President of the Conference on Disarmament, Ambassador Benjelloun Toumi of Morocco. His skill and determination helped bring about the decision of the Conference set forth in document CD/1360 of 22 September 1995.

According to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21, which we have submitted for the consideration of the First Committee, the General Assembly would recall the report of 12 August 1993 of the Special Coordinator for Membership designated by the Conference on Disarmament and the subsequent statement made by the Special Coordinator on 26 August 1993, recommending a dynamic solution to the question of membership, It would recognize the legitimate aspirations of all countries that have applied for membership to participate fully in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. It would acknowledge decision CD/1356 taken at the 719th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament on 21 September 1995, including the commitment to implement the decision at the earliest possible date. It would call for the implementation of decision CD/1356, on the expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament on an urgent basis. It would strongly urge that the new members should, in pursuance of decision CD/1356 and, with particular reference to the provisions contained in paragraph 2 of that decision, all assume together membership of the Conference at the start of the 1996 session of the Conference and would also call on the Conference on Disarmament, in accordance with its decision CD/1356, to review the situation following the presentation of progress reports by the President of the Conference on ongoing consultations at the end of each part of its annual session.

The drafters of the resolution on the expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament have also today agreed to include a further paragraph stipulating that the General Assembly:

> "Urges that, following the presentation of progress reports by the President of the Conference, the other candidatures to date be further considered by the Conference at its 1996 session."

Consultations with the members of the Conference on Disarmament and other interested delegations are continuing. We are hopeful that there is an emerging consensus on the text of this draft resolution, which will make it possible for it to be adopted without a vote, as was the case with last year's resolution on this topic.

The Chairman returned to the Chair.

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of Mexico to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.5.

Miss Rovirosa (Mexico) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: As is traditional, my delegation has the honour to introduce to the Committee on behalf of its 28 sponsors, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.5, under agenda item 77, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

Every year a growing number of States in the region join in sponsoring this text. Every year, also, the General Assembly adopts it without a vote. These facts attest to the importance of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, not only for the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, but also for all nations that love peace. They give due importance to Latin America's efforts to consolidate the first densely populated area to be entirely free of nuclear weapons. With the adherence of Saint Lucia and the ratification by Saint Kitts and Nevis as well as the adherence of the Government of Cuba in the course of this year, the Treaty has now come into effect for 30 of the 36 States in our region.

The conclusion of the pioneer enterprise is approaching its goal. The consolidation of the Treaty of Tlatelolco has also provided an example and encouragement for the preparation of other treaties establishing nuclear-free zones, such as the Treaty of Rarotonga in the South Pacific, the forthcoming conclusion of the Treaty of Pelindaba on the African continent, and negotiations relating to South-East Asia. When these treaties have fully come into effect the broad area of the southern hemisphere of the Earth will be free of the nuclear threat.

The preamble of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.5 reflects the most recent events, such as the adherence to and ratification of the Treaty by Saint Lucia and by Saint Kitts and Nevis and its signature by Cuba. It also notes that the

amended Treaty is now fully in force for eight States in the region, including my own.

In the operative paragraphs the General Assembly would welcome the concrete steps taken by several countries of the region during the past year for the consolidation of the regime of military denuclearization established by the Treaty. It would note with satisfaction the full adherence of Saint Lucia to the Treaty and would urge the countries of the region that have not yet done so to deposit their instruments of ratification of the amendments to the Treaty approved by the General Conference of the Agency on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean — OPANAL — in 1990, 1991 and 1992.

The draft resolution reflects the will and determination of the Latin American and Caribbean region to promote peace and to eliminate nuclear weapons. The prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean is of paramount importance and should be supported without reservation by the international community and the First Committee. We hope that, as in previous years, the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of India to introduce draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/50/L.47 and A/C.1/50/L.48.

Ms. Ghose (India): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.47, which is sponsored by 27 countries, namely, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Colombia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Haiti, Indonesia, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, the Federated States of Micronesia, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, the Philippines, the Sudan, Viet Nam and my own delegation.

In introducing this draft resolution, I should like briefly to recapitulate the context in which this draft resolution is being put forward.

While the draft resolution itself is similar to ones which have been adopted by an overwhelming majority in the General Assembly in the past, today's context is somewhat different, as has been articulated by almost all speakers, not least the sponsors, in the general debate in this Committee and in the plenary Assembly.

It is our view that the time is now appropriate to address squarely the issue of the possession of nuclear weapons by a few countries, and the potential threat that the existence of such weapons continues to pose to international peace and security. Since May this year, we have noted a remarkable reluctance on the part of some of the nuclear-weapon States even to address the issue of nuclear disarmament in a multilateral framework.

Some tentative steps are indeed being taken to maintain the status quo at least, to halt nuclear proliferation, both horizontal and vertical, through, for example, the comprehensive test-ban treaty, but these steps will be rendered meaningless unless the issue of nuclear disarmament is taken up at the same time. Recognizing that the process — should it ever begin — will be a long one, we feel that it is necessary to freeze the use of these weapons, and the threat of their use. This would not only provide a kind of security assurance to non-nuclear-weapon States, as validly demanded by them, but would also introduce a degree of confidence in the seriousness of ongoing disarmament negotiations and add an impetus for their successful conclusion.

Such a convention as is envisaged in the draft resolution would, in our view, be a legitimate and practical step towards the goal of the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework. Clearly, the adoption of such a resolution would send as clear a signal as possible to those nuclear-weapon States that still believe in the validity of the doctrine of deterrence.

Is it conceivable that the world would sit by and accept the use or threat of use of these terrible weapons against a non-nuclear-weapon State? Is it conceivable that international peace and security would be served if the nuclear-weapon States continue to maintain the right to use or threaten to use such weapons against each other? These are not just questions relating to national security; these are questions about the shape of the future world.

It is in this context that this draft resolution has been sponsored and submitted in this Committee. The draft resolution underlines that the use of nuclear weapons poses the most serious threat to the survival of mankind. In this text the General Assembly would welcome the recent nuclear disarmament measures initiated by the United States and the Russian Federation; note that a multilateral agreement prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would strengthen international security and help promote a climate for negotiations leading to the ultimate

elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.

The sixth preambular paragraph clearly stresses that such a convention would be an important step in a phased programme towards the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.

In operative paragraph 1 the General Assembly would reiterate the request to the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations, on a priority basis, to reach an agreement on an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances, taking as a possible basis the annexed draft convention.

Given the seriousness of the situation today, we look forward to the widest possible support from the Committee for the draft resolution.

I also have the honour to introduce the second draft resolution, contained in document A/C.1/50/L.48, on behalf of the delegations of Bhutan, Guyana, Indonesia, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Nepal, Nigeria, Sri Lanka and my own delegation, India.

We have tried in this draft resolution to deal with three interlocking and crucial issues in the context of the role of science and technology in international security and disarmament issues.

First, we have flagged the importance of the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the arms build-up as promoted by science and technology, that is, the negative impacts of science and technology. The action of States parties to the Convention on conventional weapons to ban the use and transfer of blinding weapons while those weapons were still at the prototype stage is a case in point.

Secondly, in this draft resolution the General Assembly would recognize that scientific and technological developments can have both civilian and military applications and that progress in science and technology for civilian applications needs to be maintained and encouraged. It would also take into account the fact that international transfers of high-technology products, services and know-how for peaceful purposes are important for the economic and social development of States.

The third point that is addressed by the draft resolution is referred to in the fourth preambular paragraph, which recalls the Final Declaration of the Eleventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Cartagena recently. In the Final Declaration, the Heads of State or Government noted that restrictions placed on access to technology through non-transparent, ad hoc export control regimes with exclusive membership tended to impede the economic and social development of developing countries by denying them access to technological developments. Therefore, in operative paragraph 3 Member States are urged to undertake multilateral negotiations with participation by all interested States in order to establish universally acceptable and non-discriminatory guidelines for international transfers of high technology with military applications.

In the draft resolution a call is also made for the promotion of the exchange of technological know-how for peaceful purposes, and the Secretary-General is requested to develop a database of concerned research institutions and experts with a view to promoting transparency and international cooperation in the applications of scientific and technological developments for pursuing disarmament objectives such as the disposal of weapons, conversion and so on.

It will be noted that this particular draft resolution is an update of a similar draft resolution submitted last year; in fact, we have tried to move towards having a single resolution on this very important subject, and we deeply regret that it was not possible for us to have such a single draft resolution this year. The main objection remains the arbitrary, ad hoc export-control regimes, which tend to limit, in a discriminatory way, access to technologies for peaceful purposes.

We are sure that a large number of countries share our point of view. We commend this draft resolution to the Committee, and hope that it will obtain widespread support.

I should now like to comment very briefly on some of the draft resolutions that have been introduced in this Committee on behalf of India and which India would have liked to join in sponsoring but was unable to.

Turning to the draft resolution on chemical weapons (A/C.1/50/L.14), which was introduced yesterday: we would have liked to be a sponsor. We were amongst the first signatories — and as we mentioned in the general debate, we are in the process of depositing the instrument of ratification — of this agreement. We therefore felt that the time was right for us to call on those that have not ratified to do so; however, we are aware that, at The Hague, the situation is not as we feel it should be.

Agreements that have already been made — the text of the agreement itself — appear to be unravelling. We would have encouraged the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons to continue in its efforts to carry out its given mandate rather than welcome the ongoing efforts.

On this issue, the particular agreement that had been reached was that the text of article 11 of the chemical weapons Convention had been adopted on the understanding that the ad hoc export regime relating to this area — the so-called Australia Group — would cease to exist once we accepted this agreement. We do not see any signs of this, and what I said about ad hoc export regimes in introducing our second draft resolution just now certainly applies in this case.

The second draft resolution of which we would very much have liked to be a co-sponsor gives us the same problem. This is the draft resolution on a moratorium on the export of land-mines (A/C.1/50/L.45). We were a sponsor of this very resolution last year. We were active participants in Vienna in the drafting of Protocol II. We were very keen to be a sponsor of the draft resolution again this year. However, this draft resolution has moved towards the inclusion of some substantive areas. For example, the fifteenth preambular paragraph includes a reference to an ad hoc regime, indirect though it is, and this has precluded our supporting this particular draft resolution.

We have another problem that we have mentioned to the sponsors on the implementation of this agreement, which is still under negotiation. Since, unfortunately, the sponsors were unable to take our concerns on board, we will have to satisfy ourselves with merely supporting this draft resolution when it comes up for action.

There is also a draft resolution on small arms that was introduced today by the delegation of Japan — draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7. Again, we would have liked to join in sponsoring this particular draft resolution. However, we feel that the mandate, as contained in that draft resolution, for the proposed panel to be set up by the Secretary-General, is too broad and too vague and might lead to difficulties in actual implementation. Had a tighter mandate been possible in the draft resolution, we would have had no hesitation in being a co-sponsor.

There were two other very important draft resolutions of which India has been a co-sponsor in the past: those on a comprehensive test-ban treaty and on a cut-off of fissile material. For both of these draft resolutions, given the new context to which I referred at the beginning of my intervention this afternoon, we had suggested to the sponsors preambular paragraphs that would locate both these treaties — the treaty under negotiation and the proposed treaty — in the context of the elimination of nuclear weapons within a phased programme and a time-bound framework. However, as I mentioned in my statement introducing the draft resolution on the convention on prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons, there is a reluctance on the part of nuclear-weapon States and others who fear their vote to include, even in the preambular paragraphs, references to what we believe is an essential part of both these treaties.

But, just in case it is felt that our commitment to the goals of these two treaties is in any way diluted, I should like to take this opportunity to assure the sponsors that this is not so. We regret not being able to join them as a sponsor of these draft resolutions but we will be participating in the negotiations as and when they take place.

I should like to make a brief comment on the draft resolution introduced by the representative of the Netherlands on transparency in armaments (A/C.1/50/L.18). This is an important draft resolution and we have supported it in the past and actively participated in all the group meetings. We have also been sending information to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms on a regular basis.

However, following General Assembly resolution 48/75 E adopted in 1993, a second panel of governmental experts was established in 1994 to assist the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and to consider its further development. We participated in this expert group and our understanding was that the view to which the expert group came — that, for the moment, the issues of the addition of new categories and the expansion of the scope of the Register to include military holdings and procurement through national production — should be kept pending. It is our feeling that it is much more important at the moment to strengthen the norm of transparency and ensure greater participation in the Register than to engage in an expansion of the scope. The Register is not, in our view, an end in itself, but part of a wider international effort to promote openness and transparency in military matters, which would, we hope, contribute towards confidence-building and security among States.

There are two other draft resolutions which we feel are extremely important and which we will be supporting

when action is taken on them. These draft resolutions relate to verification and to compliance. The Group of Governmental Experts on Verification included an Indian expert and we are well aware of the very hard work that went into the preparation of the report. We feel that the draft resolution is right in calling the attention of Member States to this report. It is important that Member States give their views on how to refine the verification procedures.

However, we have not been able to join as a co-sponsor because the issue of verification has been taking on different connotations, depending on the area in which they are being considered. As is well known, we are negotiating very intensely the verification regime for the comprehensive test-ban treaty. We do not believe that a single verification regime applies across the board. What is applicable to chemical weapons need not necessarily be applicable to biological weapons or, indeed, to nuclear testing. It was with this wider thinking in view that we felt that we should like to support the draft resolution without necessarily being a co-sponsor at this stage.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of South Africa, who will introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.23 and A/C.1/50/L.22.

Ms. Mxakato-Diseko (South Africa): It is a singular honour for me to introduce on behalf of the African Group the draft resolutions on an African nuclear-weapon-free zone (A/C.1/50/L.23) and on the prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes (A/C.1/50/L.22).

It has been over 30 years since the idea of an African nuclear-weapon-free zone was first conceived, and what we are seeing this year is the culmination of years of negotiation and hard work.

For many years, a major obstacle was in fact my own country's non-accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). This problem was overcome when South Africa not only acceded to the NPT, but also voluntarily and unilaterally stepped back from the nuclear-weapon threshold and dismantled its nuclear-weapons programme. This unique event gave the idea of an African nuclear-weapon-free zone fresh impetus and earlier this year a draft text for an African nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty was drawn up. This text was approved by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) Council of Ministers and confirmed by the Heads of State of the OAU at their meeting in Addis Ababa in June this year.

We now wish to present the text of the Pelindaba Treaty to the General Assembly and invite the members of the First Committee to support the draft resolution on this topic. The strength of the Treaty will lie in the support which it obtains from countries of Africa, the international community and the nuclear-weapon States in particular. In this regard, it is particularly important that the nuclear-weapon States should sign the relevant Protocols to the Treaty as soon as they become available.

Under the draft resolution the General Assembly would invite the African States to sign and ratify the Pelindaba Treaty as soon as possible. It would call upon all States to respect the continent of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone; and would also call upon the States contemplated in Protocol III of the Pelindaba Treaty to take all necessary measures to ensure the speedy application of the Treaty to territories for which they were, *de jure* or de facto, internationally responsible, and which lay within the limits of the geographical zone established in the Treaty; and would further call upon the nuclear-weapon States to bring the necessary support to the Pelindaba Treaty by signing the Protocols that concerned them as soon as the Treaty became available for signature.

Furthermore, the General Assembly would express its profound gratitude to the Secretary-General for the diligence with which he had rendered effective technical advice and financial assistance to the Organization of African Unity towards the six meetings of the Group of Experts, set up jointly by the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations. It would request the Secretary-General, within existing resources, to extend to the African States in 1996 such facilities and assistance as might be requested, in order to achieve the aims of the resolution. It decided to include in the provisional agenda of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly an item entitled "African nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty".

Through you, Sir, the members of the African Group appeal to all the members of the First Committee to support the draft resolution on an African nuclear-weapon-free zone and, as was the case last year, to adopt it without a vote.

I come now to the draft resolution on the prohibition of the dumping of radioactive waste (A/C.1/50/L.22). This is a subject of great concern to the members of the African Group and one that is also taken up in the Pelindaba Treaty. In the operative part of the draft resolution the General Assembly would take note of the part of the report of the Conference on Disarmament relating to a future convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons. It

would express grave concern regarding any use of nuclear wastes that would constitute radiological warfare and have grave implications for the national security of all States. It would call upon all States to take appropriate measures with a view to preventing any dumping of nuclear or radioactive wastes that would infringe the sovereignty of States. It would request the Conference on Disarmament to take into account, in the negotiations for a convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons, radioactive wastes as part of the scope of such a convention. It would also request the Conference on Disarmament to intensify efforts towards an early conclusion of such a convention and to include in its report to the General Assembly at its fifty-first session the progress recorded in the negotiations on the subject.

The Assembly would take note of resolution CM/Res.1356 (LIV) of 1991, adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity on the Bamako Convention on the Ban on the Import of Hazardous Wastes into Africa and on the Control of Their Transboundary Movements within Africa. That resolution expresses the hope that the effective implementation of the International Atomic Energy Agency Code of Practice on the International Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Waste will enhance the protection of all States from the dumping of radioactive wastes on their territories. It requests the International Atomic Energy Agency to continue keeping the subject under active review, including the desirability of concluding a legally binding instrument in this field.

By draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.22 the Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its fifty-first session the item entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes".

Through you, Sir, the members of the African Group appeal to all the members of the First Committee to support the draft resolution on the prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes and, as was the case last year, to adopt it without a vote.

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1: Croatia, Iceland, Indonesia and Lithuania;

A/C.1/50/L.3: Kyrgyzstan and Venezuela;

A/C.1/50/L.5: Bahamas;

A/C.1/50/L.8: Lithuania;

A/C.1/50/L.11: China;

A/C.1/50/L.15: Bangladesh, Iceland and Lithuania;

A/C.1/50/L.16: Singapore;

A/C.1/50/L.21: Bangladesh;

A/C.1/50/L.28: Indonesia;

A/C.1/50/L.33: Bangladesh;

A/C.1/50/L.34: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Monaco and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;

A/C.1/50/L.37: Georgia;

A/C.1/50/L.39: Indonesia, Kenya and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;

A/C.1/50/L.42: Georgia;

A/C.1/50/L.45: Bahamas and Ecuador;

A/C.1/50/L.46: Kenya;

A/C.1/50/L.48: Kenya and Guyana;

A/C.1/50/L.36: United Kingdom;

A/C.1/50/L.12: Kenya;

A/C.1/50/L.32: Kenya;

A/C.1/50/L.14: Croatia; and

A/C.1/50/L.23: Marshall Islands.

Programme of work

The Chairman: I should like to inform representatives that the officers of the Committee, with the assistance of the Secretariat, are in the process of preparing and finalizing a paper clustering all draft resolutions submitted to the Committee under various disarmament and international security agenda items. It is their intention to

finalize the paper after concluding the necessary consultations at their meeting, which is scheduled to take place today immediately after this morning's meeting of the First Committee, in order to be able to present the paper to the Committee tomorrow.

I should like to inform the Committee that, although a large number of draft resolutions have already been formally introduced in the Committee, a few others remain to be introduced. In view of these developments, I should like to suggest that the Committee begin action on draft resolutions on Friday, 10 November, instead of tomorrow as initially scheduled, in order to enable the sponsors of the remaining draft resolutions to introduce their texts, if they wish to do so, on Thursday, 9 November, and to allow as well for comments or statements to be presented on any of the draft resolutions.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees with this suggestion.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.